



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cle
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,366	12/09/2003	Carmelita G. Frondoza	03409-PA-DIV	4407

7590 06/30/2006

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
Suite 220
502 Washington Avenue
Towson, MD 21204

EXAMINER

MAKAR, KIMBERLY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,366	Applicant(s) FRONDOZA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kimberly A. Makar	Art Unit 1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7,8,11,15,20,23,24,30,35-38,54-57 and 60-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 5,7-8,11,15,20,23,24,30,35-38,54-57,60-62 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1,2,4,5,7,8,11,15,20,23,24,30, and 35, drawn to a method of treating a lesion or cavity in a tissue comprising the administration of a solid implant and an injectable cell-containing formulation, classified in class 604, subclass 502.
 - II. Claims 36-38, drawn to a method for replacing a tissue or body part comprising the administration of a solid implant and an injectable cell-containing formulation, classified in class 128, subclass 899.
 - III. Claims 54-57, 60-62, drawn to an implant for a cavity of a body comprised of a microcarrier and an interface layer of cells, classified in class 523, subclass 113.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are directed to related inventions. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, invention I is a method of treating a lesion or a cavity comprising filling the lesion or cavity with a solid implant along with an injectable cell containing formulation whereas invention II is a method for replacing a tissue or body part using a solid implant and an injectable cell-containing formulation. These processes are distinct because the methods for treating

a lesion or cavity will have distinct steps from total tissue or body part placement. The length of time the implants are kept in the body for the desired effect will vary depending upon what type of lesion, tissue etc. that is being treated which will differ from the long term integration of the implants for tissue replacement in the body. The type of compositions for the two inventions will be distinct depending upon what area of the body is being treated on the short term (degradable components? Absorbable components? Addition of therapeutic factors for treatment?) versus the long term tissue or cavity replacement where the implant will be subjected to material stress and potential long term immunological effects as a result of the tissue replacement. Thus These two methods are distinct in scope, design, and function and are thus capable of supporting individual patents.

3. Inventions I and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case invention I is a method for treating a lesion or cavity in the body comprising filling the lesion or cavity with a solid implant along with an injectable cell containing formulation whereas invention III is the solid implant for filling a cavity in the body. These two inventions are distinct because there are other apparatuses available for implantation for the purpose of treating lesions, there are injectable genetically engineered cells that can target specific tissue or pathological conditions, metal plates capable of repairing bone, artificial joints capable of treating arthritic conditions, etc.

Art Unit: 1636

Thus these methods are biologically, compositionally and functionally distinct they are thus capable of supporting individual patents.

4. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case invention II is a method for replacing a tissue or body part using a solid implant and an injectable cell-containing formulation whereas invention III is the solid implant for filling a cavity in the body. These two inventions are distinct because there are other apparatuses available for implantation for the purpose of tissue replacement such as injectable genetically engineered cells that can target specific tissues, metal rods capable of replacing bone, artificial joints capable of replacing ones in need, skin grafts, etc. Thus these methods are biologically, compositionally and functionally distinct they are thus capable of supporting individual patents.

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

Art Unit: 1636


are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly A. Makar, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-4139. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KAM/06/23/06


DAVID GUZO
PRIMARY EXAMINER